

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 866

FL 013 637

AUTHOR Cohen, Andrew D.
TITLE Reformulating Second-Language Compositions: A Potential Source of Input for the Learner.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 25p.; For related document, see ED 224 338. Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (17th, Toronto, Ontario, March 15-20, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Hebrew; Higher Education; Language Research; Learning Activities; *Second Language Instruction; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A feedback technique for second-language compositions is that of "reformulation." This procedure consists of having a native writer of the target language rewrite the learner's essay, preserving all the learner's ideas. The learner then compares this version with the original version, complete with teacher corrections. To determine the benefits of this technique, 53 learners of Hebrew were divided into two groups, a reformulation group and a teacher-correction group. The students were asked to write three compositions over an 8-week period. All students met with research assistants during the 2-month period. The corpus of data for assessment came from eight students in each group. Students, teachers, and research assistants all contributed evaluations. Findings indicate that teacher-corrected compositions were more appreciated and contributed more to student improvement in writing skills. Generally, students also found that discussing their errors with a native speaker (the research assistant) was an advantage. With regard to the reformulation group, there were mixed reactions. Generally, the students were not able to compare the two versions without teacher assistance. One conclusion of the study is that the reformulation technique might be successfully used with conscious learners who would welcome explicit comparisons. (AMH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED228866

Reformulating Second-Language Compositions:
A Potential Source of Input for the Learner^{1,2}

Andrew D. Cohen

School of Education

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

April 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Andrew D. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1. First revision of a paper presented at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention, Toronto, March 15-20, 1983.
2. I wish to acknowledge my research assistants, Michal Merom, Tamir Yakobovitch, and Megi Sira, for their fine work and numerous insights regarding the research effort; the cooperating teachers in the intensive summer language program, Yona Weiss, Yael Mashler, Uzi Yizhar, and Smadar Barak; the participating students from the summer program; and the Hebrew teachers from Ulpan Akiva in Netanya, from Beersheva, and from Jerusalem, who graciously agreed to rate the compositions. My thanks also to the administrative staff at Ulpan Akiva for typing the compositions.

FL013 637

INTRODUCTION

While the input that language teachers provide even intermediate and advanced learners regarding the form of compositions may emphasize low-level corrections (e.g., basic vocabulary, grammatical forms, mechanics), their input regarding higher-level phenomena (i.e., the appropriate lexical choices, syntactic structures, and cohesive markers for the type of text involved) may contribute more in the long run to the overall effect of the students' writing. Even though native writers differ in style from one to the next, the nonnative writer invariably produces some or even many sentences containing elements that natives would rarely produce. Thus, the issue is really one of how to get the nonnative writer sounding more nativelike -- if such an endeavor is deemed valuable for the given group of learners. One means is through copious reading of target language material (Krashen 1981). Certainly the nonnative improves in speaking by hearing a lot of spoken language. But what about nonnative writers who do not read extensively in the target language, or who may not read extensively the style of writing in which they are to write? How do they receive enough input in order to improve their writing abilities? It is not uncommon, for instance, to hear an advanced second-language user complaining about how he or she has simply not advanced in writing skills since attaining an intermediate level some years ago.

One major source of input is that of teacher feedback or correction on essays. Although systems of teacher feedback on student compositions vary, they are often characterized by comments concerning choice of content, organization of ideas, and use of language. Correction may mean indicating the type of error, and possibly also indicating the correct form (see, for

example, Knapp 1972, Gorman 1979, Hendrickson 1980, Sharwood Smith 1982). Depending on the system of feedback that the teachers use, in actual practice they may not edit thoroughly or rewrite even a small portion of an essay. If this is the case, then rather than converting each student's essay into something that reads in a nativelike fashion, the product is more that of patch-up work. For example, the teacher may correct several glaring mistakes in choice of vocabulary. The problem is that within a context of words and phrases that are not quite nativelike, a teacher may leave other inappropriate forms as they are. Particularity if students are encouraged to rewrite these patched-up essays at home (as Pilleux 1982 and others recommend), such a process may be encouraging the learner to fossilize interlanguage structures, rather than to move on toward mastery.

Many teachers and researchers are aware of the problems inherent in "traditional" methods of composition correction and so seek out new methods to replace or supplement these. Such methods are characterized by varying degrees of teacher correction, student self-correction, and peer correction. One approach avoids intensive teacher correction of errors in short essays, and instead stresses extensive writing -- the rationale being that enhanced confidence in writing will eventually lead to more error-free writing as well. Research findings have shown that this approach can not only produce more output but also reduce errors (Brière 1966, Shaw 1982). Another approach calling for limited teacher correction consists of having students do a series of short writing tasks. For each task, the teacher provides a corrected student paper and a series of questions intended to assist the students in assessing this paper. This process of guided discovery deals with questions of the quality of the ideas, organization, syntax, complexity of

language structure, and breadth of vocabulary. It is intended that the students will come to indentify errors in their own writing by noting similar errors in the paper under discussion (Cumming and Mackay 1982).

Jacobs (1982) maintains that it is not enough to simply provide a model of good writing. Rather, the teacher must intervene to suggest where the essay is in need of work. Yet she is opposed to providing the student with teacher editing, both because it then eliminates the learner's own personal point of discovery and because it is not easy for teachers to rewrite parts of learners' sentences without having to make corrections in other parts of the essay. In a method proposed by Anderson (1981), students are engaged in rigorous editing under teacher supervision. Students put their essay through six drafts with a new draft at each of five levels of analysis: word, sentence, inter-sentence, paragraph, and general overview. First, the teacher corrects the papers. Then the first edit is conducted -- as a group process. Subsequent edits are conducted by the students individually.

Other methods of composition correction call for peer assessment (Witbeck 1976). For example, in one method, two students correct the paper of a third student according to specific points designated by the teacher. Usually these points would consist of areas of current focus in the classroom. In a variation of this method, two or three students receive a fellow student's essay that has clues as to problem areas. The students must determine exactly what the nature of the error is and what the correction should be. Another peer correction technique involves having the teacher take five or six essays, edit out minor errors, and type them up for class discussion. Then groups of two or three students must assess an essay, first individually and then in their group.

Finally, there are methods stressing the need for extensive teacher input. One such method (Pica 1982) has teachers responding in complete paragraphs to what students write. This form of correction is intended to provide substantial written interaction between the teacher and the student. The researcher contends that typical teacher correction does not furnish adequate input for the learner to know how to write more appropriately. In fact, Pica contends that typical teacher corrections are characterized in part by the same errors that they are correcting in the essays -- e.g., absence of tense or number marking on verbs, no determiner with nouns, use of sentence fragments, and so forth. A small study that she conducted showed that a subsequent increase in mean T-unit length, mean length of paragraphs, number of T-units, and a decrease in number of errors per clause, had a stronger correlation with her extensive feedback method than with the more traditional method of teacher feedback in the form of limited sentence and sub-sentence commentary.

As the above discussion may suggest, there really is no consensus as to whether extensive or limited correction is best, as to who should do the correcting, and so forth. This was also the finding of a recent review of the literature (Walz 1982). The current state of affairs seems to warrant further exploration into feedback techniques, and one such technique worthy of investigation is that of "reformulation," proposed by Levenston (1978). The technique consists of having a native writer of the target language rewrite the learner's essay, preserving all the learner's ideas, making it sound as nativelike as possible. Such reformulation, then, marks a departure from even the best edit of such an essay. The reason for having natives reformulate what the nonnatives wrote rather than writing about their own ideas, is that

in this way the nonnatives are able to feel that the essay is still theirs, even though reformulated. This factor is intended to motivate them to compare the original version (with teacher corrections) and the reformulated one, with regard to vocabulary, syntax, cohesion, and rhetorical functions.

This paper reports on the third in a series of studies aimed at determining the benefits of using the reformulation technique as a means of providing feedback to learners concerning their second-language writing (see also Cohen 1983a, Cohen 1983b). The research questions for this study were as follows:

1. How do the compositions of learners receiving the reformulation technique compare with those of learners receiving an explanation of the teachers' corrections?
2. Can native judges distinguish nonnative essays (with teacher corrections incorporated) from versions of those same essays that have been reformulated by natives?
3. How does student assessment of the reformulation technique compare to that of the correction technique?
4. To what extent do qualitative data from research assistants and from teachers elucidate the findings for the above questions?

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 53 learners of Hebrew as a second language, studying in a 10-week intensive summer course at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. They constituted most of the students in four classes at an advanced level of study (the fifth of six levels). Three

research assistants read each student's first essay for the study and ranked the students according to their writing ability (3, 2+, 2, 1+, 1). The students were then randomly assigned in matched pairs to one of two treatment groups -- 27 to a reformulation group and 26 to a correction group -- on the basis of their mean rankings. Due to attrition, 20 students from the reformulation group and 22 from the correction group participated in the study through to its end.

Instrumentation and Procedures

The Composition Writing Task: The students were asked to write three compositions over an eight week period. At each writing period the students had a choice of three topics. The choices for the first essay were: "The Best Friend I ever had," "The 'Peace in the Galilee' Operation -- My Position," or "My Musical Taste." The choices for the second essay were: "If I were a Pioneer in Israel," "The Good Life," or "The Influence of T.V. on our Life." The choices for the third essay were: "Scenes that I have Loved in Israel," "The Perfect Mate," or "Zionism -- Ideals and Reality." The essay topics were selected by the three research assistants for the study, who were themselves undergraduates at the university (in English linguistics, English literature, and Education, respectively).

The students in the Reformulation group wrote their essays, received corrections on them from their teachers, and then found peer reformulators (either from their local dorms or elsewhere) to rewrite the composition in their own words. The reformulators were given a sheet of instructions which explained that the composition was an important part of linguistic research that had as its purpose to improve written expression by means of comparing

student writing to that of a native Hebrew writer. These reformulators were asked to read the whole composition through and to make sure that they understood the basic message and thoughts of the writer. Then they were to reformulate the essay in their own words, making sure to preserve the content and order of ideas. They were not to add or delete information. When the students received their essay back from the reformulators, they then compared the two versions under the guidance of the research assistant that they were assigned to. Often the same native writer served as reformulator for all three essays.

The students in the Correction group also gave their essays to the teacher for correction, and then met with one of the research assistants -- in this case, just to discuss the teachers' corrections. For the most part, the students in both groups met with the assistants individually. Some effort was made to encourage the learners to meet in groups, but this did not prove to be so profitable -- particularly with the Reformulation group -- since there was considerable variation from student to student as to problem areas. Each of the three research assistants was assigned to an equal number of Reformulation and Correction group students, and continued to meet with these students over the two-month period. The length of the sessions varied from 30 minutes to an hour and a half, with most sessions lasting about an hour.

Judges' Ratings of Compositions: In order to have a manageable corpus of data for assessment, eight students from the Reformulation group and eight from the Correction group were randomly selected. The two groups had received a similar spread of average ratings from the three research assistants on their first essay (Reformulation group: 3.0, 2.7, 2.3, 2.0, 2.0, 1.7, 1.3, 1.0; Correction group: 3.0, 2.7, 2.3, 1.8, 1.7, 1.7, 1.3, 1.0).

The three essays from each of the sixteen students, plus the three essays from each of the eight native reformulators constituted a corpus of 72 essays, each consisting of 300-400 words. The first 100 words of each of these essays were typed, correcting for minor grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.

These 72 essays were then arranged into six sets of 12 so that neither two essays from the same student nor an original and the reformulated version of an essay appeared in the same set. It was felt that if the judges encountered two versions of the same essay to rate, this might give away that fact that one was written by a native. Eighteen native-speaking Hebrew teachers (employed mostly in adult second language programs, in Netanya, Jerusalem, and Beersheva) were selected as judges, with three of them rating each of the six sets of essays. The judges were not informed as to whether the writer was in the Reformulation or Correction group, or a native reformulator, nor whether it was the first, second, or third essay. Each set of 12 essays had in it four essays from students in the Reformulation group, four essays from reformulators, and four essays from students in the Correction group.

The judges were asked to read all 12 of the 100-word excerpts. Then they were asked to rate each composition according to three nine-point scales (1-2/very poor; 3-4/poor; 5-6/average; 7-8/good; 9/excellent) -- for vocabulary, syntax, and cohesion. With regard to vocabulary, they were asked to rate how exact they felt the word choice was and whether the words were appropriate for the given context. With regard to syntax, they were to judge whether the choice of clauses (phrases, structures) was appropriate, whether the ordering of clauses was acceptable, and whether there was adequate grammatical agreement. With regard to cohesion, they were to rate for clarity

in the connection between elements within the sentence and across sentences -- i.e., appropriate use of connectors, pronouns, synonyms, and the like. Whenever they were in doubt about how to rate a particular essay on a particular scale, they were to refer to their corpus of 12 essays as the basis for decision making.

Student, Teacher, and Research Assistant Evaluations: A student evaluation form was drawn up, consisting of the following issues: the extent to which participation in the project helped improve their general ability to write in Hebrew, their vocabulary ability, their knowledge of how to use grammatical structures, and their understanding of and ability to use cohesive markers; the extent to which the meetings with research assistants were beneficial; and the extent to which the reformulation/teacher correction technique itself (separate from the meetings with assistants) was of help. The students used a five-point rating scale (1--very little; 2--a little; 3--more or less; 4--noticeably; 5--a great deal). Finally, students were asked to note positive and negatives aspects of the research project.

Teachers were asked to give a qualitative assessment of each student who participated in the study, so as to have another rating as to the students' language performance, beyond the ratings of the research assistants and the judges. Teachers were asked to describe briefly what kind of a learner each student was -- based on the most conspicuous things -- and whether they felt that the learners were applying what they had learned. In addition, research assistants were asked to keep a record of their impressions of the students from each of the three sessions that they had with them. During staff meetings, research assistants also provided additional reactions regarding the nature of the study while in progress. These

reactions included: major insights that they recorded the learners having, observations regarding how good the learners were at identifying the nature of changes from the original to the reformulation, the extent to which learners were "monitor users" -- i.e., consciously attending to form, and general reactions that the learners had to the study. These data from the teachers and from the research assistants constituted the qualitative data for the study.

Data Analysis

The average of the three judges' ratings for each essay were summed across the Reformulation and Correction groups. Then t-tests of the difference scores between performance on essay #1 vs. #2, #2 vs. #3, and #1 vs. #3 were tallied. Difference scores were employed so as to adjust for initial differences in essays. To see if judges distinguished native from nonnative writers, a one-way analysis of variance was performed for each rating scale (vocabulary, syntax, cohesion, and total) on the Reformulation groups' original essays, the reformulators' versions, and the essays of the Correction group. A t-test was also used to compare Reformulation and Correction student ratings of the project. Finally, the teachers' assessments and the research assistants' comments were submitted to content analysis, and the findings were used in interpreting the numerical data.

The first issue for investigation was the comparative² improvement in composition writing (vocabulary, syntax, cohesion, and total) for the Reformulation and Correction group students. It was found that there were no significant differences in gains from the first to the second, nor from the second to the third essays, on any of the scales. From the first to the third essay, however, there were significant difference scores ($p < .05$) in favor of the Correction group on the syntax and cohesion scales and for the total (see Tables 1 and 2). What produced significant differences in this comparison was the fact that the means for the Reformulation group dropped on the third essay to levels even below those on the first essay, while the means for the Correction group increased slightly beyond those on the second essay.

The second research question concerned the degree to which the essays reformulated by native writers would be rated higher by the native judges. On the second composition, the differences reached significance ($p < .01$) for the vocabulary and syntax scales, and for the total. On the third composition, there was a significant difference ($p < .05$) for the vocabulary scale (see Table 1). Thus, the native writers did receive higher ratings, for a portion of the rating scales. By comparing the mean scores (see Table 1), it is clear that the main source of difference is between the native reformulators and the Reformulation group. The Correction group students had means more approximating those of the natives than did the Reformulation students.

The third research question dealt with the popularity of the two techniques in the eyes of the student consumers. In comparing student ratings for the two techniques, students in the Correction group rated the type of feedback that they received significantly higher than did those in the

Reformulation group in several areas. Specifically, the correction technique was rated as contributing more to general writing ability and ability to write cohesively than was the reformulation technique. The Correction group were also significantly more positive about the extent to which the assistants helped them (see Table 3).

The teachers' written comments on each student, the research assistants' observations, and the students' own comments generally yielded an informative picture of the students participating in the study. Since the Correction treatment emerged as generally more productive, let us first take a look at feedback regarding it. Then we will look at the Reformulation treatment.

One student in the Correction group noted that it was a real advantage to be able to talk with a native about composition errors, so as to understand why she made them and to see how to avoid making them again. Another student pointed out that it was good that they had to sit with an assistant to work over the essay, rather than just ignoring it (which they might normally do). In looking at the individual profiles of the eight Correction group students who were randomly selected to have their essays assessed by judges, at least six of these students could be termed "monitor users" -- i.e., learners who make a conscious effort to notice the way the language works. These students tended to write down the teachers' corrections. They usually did this systematically. One student explicitly expressed her interest in her own errors and in those of others. She reported that as a result of the study, she became better at explaining her own errors. Her teacher independently reported that this student made fewer errors as the course progressed.

The students had no real complaints about the Correction method. If anything, they would have liked to have more such sessions. The only major issue was that of time. The students felt that these meetings were taking time away from their regular studies. They would have liked the project to be part of the regular program.

With respect to the Reformulation technique, the students had somewhat more mixed reactions. Of the 20 who participated, 12 were basically positive in their views. These noted that the technique gave them an opportunity to see exactly what their writing problems were and then to work on them. As one student put it, "I saw the expressions that Israelis used as opposed to the ones that I write." Another noted that this was "a good way to learn from someone else." About half of these students indicated that they would continue to use the technique beyond the summer language course. For one student, learning what connectives were and about the importance of cohesion in writing were major breakthroughs. In the view of the research assistant working with him, he made a dramatic improvement between the first and second essay. His teacher noted an improvement as well. Another student was aware that the technique helped him learn expressions in Hebrew as well as something more about Hebrew sentence structure.

As it turned out, only a few Reformulation group students were able on their own to successfully compare their version with that of a native writer on their own -- i.e., identify the major differences and understand the significance of these differences. One student reported not being interested in teacher corrections but very much interested in what she discovered in the changes made in the reformulated versions -- for example, about the use of gender in Hebrew. She indicated having no difficulty comparing her own essay

and the reformulation alone. Another student said that he was able to find differences by himself but not able to understand these differences. He gave as an example a case where the reformulator combined several of his sentences into one. He was unable to explain the nature of the difference. Another student noted as follows, "I had difficulty in making use of a reformulation when it was too far from my own version." This was probably the problem for the above-mentioned student who was having difficulty seeing the relationship between his several short sentences and the one longer reformulated one.

Several Reformulation group students felt that the sessions were too short and perhaps too infrequent to provide a firm basis for learning ("Only twice a month is not enough to really help that much."). On the other hand, the students complained about having to devote so much time to this project. Students repeatedly objected to the time needed not only to submit and get back three essays, but also to find a reformulator and then get back the reformulated version. In reality, the Reformulation group had more to do than the Correction group. For this reason, the research assistants reported having to work harder to motivate the Reformulation group students to complete the designated tasks on time.

DISCUSSION

In comparing the two systems of feedback, discussion of teacher corrections and reformulation, it appears that the Correction treatment was most successful -- especially in the areas of syntax and cohesion, areas where the

Reformulation technique was expected to excel. Correction students seemed to get a clearer sense of what needed to be corrected in their work and why. For one thing, the research assistants felt comfortable in dealing with the teachers' points. The corrections were invariably consistent with class work as well. It must be remembered that this was a special treatment in that the typical language class does not provide this form of interaction centered around teachers' corrections. Instead, learners often go over corrections alone -- if at all, and the benefits are consequently more limited.

The Reformulation treatment, in the other hand, did not prove to be so effective. For one thing, this technique did not always provide feedback consistent with the class level. As one assistant put it, "Some reformulations were excellent -- using great style, but they were beyond the learners." There was also the problem that the feedback came across as more diffuse than that of teacher correction. It was less directed in the sense that the reformulators were not working to polish up the essay at hand (i.e., edit it), but rather were attempting to shift it to a nativelike level. Consequently, whereas some of the changes were striking, others were more subtle. Thus, if the nonnative writers got the impact of these subtle stylistic differences, it might still take some time for such features to become an integral part of their writing. In any case, the Reformulation students appear to have expended less effort in essay #3 than with the previous essays -- most likely due to their doubts as to the usefulness of the feedback and to their discomfort regarding the logistic demands put upon them. This would explain why these essays were rated lower by the judges.

It may seem surprising that the versions reformulated by the natives were not consistently rated higher than the versions written by nonnatives.

Yet the natives were not given free license to write however they wanted to. They were told to preserve the content and order of ideas, and not to add or delete information. Thus, they were being constrained. Had the reformulators been allowed to make major changes, the ratings may also have been higher.

As for the student evaluation questionnaires, the results are consistent with the other findings. The Correction students felt that they got more out of the technique that they were exposed to than did the Reformulation students. The Correction group were particularly pleased with the support that they received from the research assistants. This seems to underscore the fact that the assistants themselves were more comfortable, and probably more effective in the role of going over teacher corrections, rather than having to generate their own material for discussion in comparing nonnative and reformulated essays. The assistants themselves corroborated this interpretation.

CONCLUSIONS

A major problem with teacher correction of written essays is the limited nature of the feedback. This project enhanced such feedback by providing the students with in-depth discussions with native writers. Whereas the typical feedback pattern may be "underwhelming," it appears that the reformulation approach can be overwhelming. It was never envisioned that reformulating would serve as "the answer" to feedback at the advanced levels on second-language compositions. It was simply envisioned as supplementing other approaches. It was seen largely as a tool for diagnosing areas for development. Hence, one or two such sessions was considered to be adequate for such diagnosis. This study showed that students were no longer

enthusiastic about the method when they were asked to engage themselves in more than two such essay reformulations.

Perhaps a major value of the reformulation approach is that it emphasizes the fact that there is more than one correct way to write things in a second language. And these various correct ways may be noticeably different from any of the nonnative versions. The fact that judges assessed a portion of the reformulated essays as more nativelike would corroborate this contention. Regardless of whether one or another reformulator was a more gifted native writer, the reality was that they invariably produced some version of stylistically acceptable language. The research assistants reported that in only one or two cases out of 60 was a reformulation unacceptable.

It would appear that this technique may be most successfully used with "monitor users" -- conscious learners who would welcome such explicit comparisons. It was my expectation that the technique would offer the students a number of major insights or breakthroughs. The results of this study do not support that expectation. Perhaps the lack of major breakthroughs stemmed from difficulties in transferring the potential insights to the student. It would appear, for example, that most students need assistance in comparing their version with the reformulated one, and that these comparisons need to be purposely eye-opening and engaging.

There are several variations of the reformulation technique that could also be implemented. First, it may be beneficial for the learner if the native reformulator provides on-the-spot reformulating during the composing process. This approach would provide instant feedback regarding the appropriate forms to use in order to convey the intended meaning. Another

approach would be to have the learners do several edits of the essay first and then have it reformulated (Holly Jacobs, Personal Communication). The rationale for this is that a reformulation of an early version may be focusing attention on forms that would be changed in later drafts.

Whereas it might be valuable to incorporate reformulation more directly into the regular curriculum so as to alleviate the students' feelings of extra work, it would appear important to reserve it for some students some of the time. In other words, it is probably best to allow this as one alternate approach for those students who want to take on the challenge -- that is, of confronting another version of their writing which is more than correction or even thorough editing. In my opinion, the option should be left open to them.

TABLE 1

Judges' Assessment of Writing Performance:
Correction (Cor), Reformulation (Ref), and Native (Nat) Groups
N = 24 (8 in each group)

	Composition #1		Composition #2		Composition #3	
V O C A B U L A R Y	Cor: Mean	5.96	6.62		6.79	
	S.D.	1.48	0.93		0.89	
	Ref: M	5.88	6.10		5.46	
	S.D.	0.85	1.30		1.54	
	Nat: M	6.58	7.94	F = 7.30	6.94	F = 4.31
	S.D.	1.78	0.62	p < .01	0.73	p < .05
S Y N T A X	Cor: Mean	5.17	6.50		6.06	
	S.D.	1.51	0.65		0.76	
	Ref: M	5.85	5.75		4.79	
	S.D.	1.08	1.15		1.65	
	Nat: M	6.31	7.29	F = 6.46	5.87	
	S.D.	1.66	0.68	p < .01	1.26	
C O H E S I O N	Cor: Mean	5.09	6.19		6.27	
	S.D.	1.34	0.84		0.82	
	Ref: M	5.71	5.83		5.04	
	S.D.	-0.62	1.30		1.63	
	Nat: M	6.59	6.94		6.17	
	S.D.	1.41	1.23		1.45	
T O T A L	Cor: Mean	16.21	19.19		19.13	
	S.D.	4.04	2.05		2.30	
	Ref: M	17.23	17.81		15.33	
	S.D.	3.49	3.20		4.62	
	Nat: M	19.31	22.34	F = 6.94	18.98	
	S.D.	4.57	2.04	p < .01	2.96	

TABLE 2

Gain Score Comparisons between
the Correction (Cor) and Reformulation (Ref) Groups
N = 16 (8 in each group)

	Gain from Composition #1 to #2	Gain from Composition #2 to #3	Gain from Composition #1 to #3
<u>Vocabulary</u>			
Cor: Mean	0.67	0.17	0.83
S.D.	1.93	1.28	1.53
	$t = 0.45$	$t = 0.81$	$t = 1.44$
Ref: M	0.23	-0.65	-0.42
S.D.	1.93	1.49	1.19
<u>Syntax</u>			
Cor: Mean	1.34	-0.44	0.90
S.D.	1.91	0.78	1.40
	$t = 1.68$	$t = 0.63$	$t = 2.07$
Ref: M	-0.10	-0.96	-1.06
S.D.	1.48	2.18	2.28
			$p < .05$
<u>Cohesion</u>			
Cor: Mean	1.10	0.08	1.19
S.D.	1.61	1.21	1.35
	$t = 1.00$	$t = 1.08$	$t = 1.86$
Ref: M	0.13	-0.79	2.47
S.D.	2.24	1.94	-0.67
			$p < .05$
<u>Total</u>			
Cor: Mean	2.98	-0.06	2.92
S.D.	5.11	2.85	3.73
	$t = 0.88$	$t = 1.12$	$t = 1.80$
Ref: M	0.58	-2.48	-1.90
S.D.	5.73	5.40	6.58
			$p < .05$

TABLE 3

Results on the Student Evaluation Questionnaires:
Correction Group (N = 12) and Reformulation Group (N = 14)

		<u>Correction Gp.</u>	<u>Reformulation Gp.</u>
1. Improvement in Writing Ability			
	Mean	3.92	3.14
	S.D.	0.67	0.77
		$t = -2.71, p < .01$	
2. Increased Vocabulary Knowledge			
	Mean	3.33	3.07
	S.D.	0.49	0.73
		$t = -1.05$	
3. Improved Knowledge about Grammar			
	Mean	3.25	3.07
	S.D.	0.87	0.83
		$t = -0.54$	
4. Improvement in Understanding and Using Connectives			
	Mean	4.00	3.29
	S.D.	0.60	0.83
		$t = -2.48, p < .05$	
5. Benefit of Meetings with Assistants			
	Mean	4.33	3.64
	S.D.	0.78	0.84
		$t = -2.16, p < .05$	
6. Benefits of the Method of Feedback (Correction/Reformulation)			
	Mean	3.75	3.43
	S.D.	0.87	0.94
		$t = -0.90$	

REFERENCES CITED

- Anderson, P.L. 1981. The use of editing to teach composition to adults.
Honolulu: Department of English as a Second Language, U. of Hawaii.
- Brière, E.J. 1966. Quantity before quality in second language composition.
Language Learning, 16 (3-4), 141-151.
- Cohen, A.D. 1983a. Reformulating ESL compositions: A potential source of
feedback. TESOL Newsletter, 17 (1).
- Cohen, A.D. 1983b. Writing like a native: The process of reformulation. Paper
presented at the TESOL/Hawaii, 1982. ERIC ED 224338.
- Cumming, A. and Mackay, R. 1982. Increasing study involvement, minimizing
teacher dominance: The assessment and practice of writing improvement.
In J.S. Daniel et al. (Eds.), Learning at a distance: A world
perspective. Edmonton, Alberta: Athabasca University/ICCE Publication,
222-226.
- Gorman, T.P. 1979. The teaching of composition. In M. Celce-Murcia and
L. McIntosh (Eds.), Teaching English as a second or foreign language.
Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 189-202.
- Hendrickson, J.M. 1980. The treatment of error in written work. Modern
Language Journal, 64 (2), 216-221.
- Jacobs, S. 1982. On learning to write academic essays: Case studies.
Honolulu: English Department, U. of Hawaii.
- Krashen, S. 1981. The role of input (reading) and instruction in developing
writing ability. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
(Summarized by E. Hatch in: Discourse analysis and language learning.
Studia Linguistica, 1981, 35 (1-2), 219:221.)

- Knapp, D. 1972. A focused, efficient method to relate composition correction to teaching aims. In H.B. Allen and R.W. Campbell (Eds.), Teaching English as a second language. 2nd ed. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill International, 213-221.
- Levenston, E.A. 1978. Error analysis of free composition: The theory and the practice. Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4 (1), 1-11.
- Pica, T. 1982. Variations on a theme: An interactional approach to ESL writing. Philadelphia: Graduate School of Education, U. of Pennsylvania.
- Pilleux, M. 1982. Correcting without frustrating. TESOL Reporter, 15 (3), 52-56.
- Sharwood Smith, Michael. 1982. First steps in writing for academic purposes. 2nd ed. Utrecht: English Department, Utrecht University.
- Shaw, P.A. 1982. Fluency in the ESL writing skill. Los Angeles: ESL Section, Dept. of English, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Walz, Joel C. 1982. Error correction techniques for the foreign language classroom. Language in Education Series, No. 50. Washington, D.C.: CAL/ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
- Witbeck, M.C. 1976. Peer correction procedures for intermediate and advanced ESL composition lessons. TESOL Quarterly, 10 (3), 321-326.